UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/803,288	03/18/2004	Glenn C. Forrester	21986-00001	5657

76656   7590   06/17/2011

Patent Docket Department
Armstrong Teasdale LLP
7700 Forsyth Boulevard
Suite 1800
St. Louis, MO 63105

EXAMINER
BATURAY, ALICIA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2441	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/17/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USpatents@armstrongteasdale.com

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/803,288	FORRESTER, GLENN C.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Alicia Baturay	2441	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 April 2011</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-25</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-25</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>03 October 2007</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office Action is in response to the amendment filed 06 April 2011.

2.   Claims 1, 3-10, 16, 18, 19, 22, 23, and 25 were amended.

3.   Claims 1-25 are pending in this Office Action.

Response to Amendment

4.   The objection to claim 10 regarding minor informalities was addressed and is withdrawn.

5.   The objections to the specification regarding the failure to provide proper antecedent basis was addressed and is withdrawn.

6.   The rejection of claims 1, 9, 10, 18, 19, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement was addressed and is withdrawn.

7.   The rejection of claims 6, 16, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement was addressed and is withdrawn.

8.   The rejection of claims 1, 9, 10, 18, 19, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph for a lack of antecedent basis was addressed and is withdrawn.

9.   The rejection of claims 6, 16, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph for a lack of antecedent basis was addressed and is withdrawn.

10.   Applicant's amendments and arguments with respect to claims 1-25 filed on 06 April 2011 have been fully considered but they are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 8, 10-14, 17, 19, 20, 22, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Stevenson et al. (U.S. 7,257,585) in view of Fields et al. (U.S. 6,338,059) in view of Baird et al. (U.S. 2002/0188603) and further in view of Skillen et al. (U.S. 6,098,065).

Stevenson teaches the invention substantially as claimed including an embodiment that is an add-on to a browser allowing the browser to augment files "on the fly," i.e. where the user directs a browser to a resource located on a network, the method analyzes the file as it is opened by the browser, augments the file with appropriate hyperlinks, and displays the augmented file with active hyperlinks. "Clicking on" the hyperlink will redirect the browser to the associated uniform resource locator (see Summary of Invention).

13. With respect to claims 1, 10 and 19, Stevenson teaches a network based system for retrieving information, said system comprising: a client system comprising a user interface and a browser (Stevenson, col. 2, lines 45-52); a centralized database for storing information (Stevenson, Fig. 2, element 39; col. 4, lines 45-47); and a server system configured to be

coupled to said client system and said database (Stevenson, Fig. 2, element 33; col. 4, line 50), said server system further configured to: enable the user to select an object from an electronic document displayed on said user interface (Stevenson, Fig. 7, element 133; col. 5, lines 21-22 and 51-53).

Stevenson does not explicitly teach enable a user to input user preference information for storing in the database and a computer-implemented command for performing the associated function.

However, Fields teaches a user to input user preference information for storing in the database (Fields, col. 5, lines 15-25), wherein each function is associated by the user with at least one universal locator (URL) and a computer-implemented command for performing the associated function, wherein the computer-implemented command is configured by the user to perform the associated function at at least one remote vendor web server corresponding to the at least one associated URL (Fields, col. 4, lines 14-22); the process further including: retrieve from the database the at least one URL and the computer-implemented command associated with the selected function (Fields, col. 5, line 51 – col. 6, line 24); execute the retrieved computer-implemented command using the selected object to generate the processed object; and the processing result generated by the at least one remote vendor web server based on the processed object (Fields, col. 6, lines 25-29).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Stevenson in view of Fields in order to enable a user to input user preference information for storing in the database, wherein each function is associated by the user with at least one universal locator (URL) and a computer-implemented command for

performing the associated function, wherein the computer-implemented command is configured by the user to perform the associated function at at least one remote vendor web server corresponding to the at least one associated URL; the process further including: retrieve from the database the at least one URL and the computer-implemented command associated with the selected function; execute the retrieved computer-implemented command using the selected object to generate the processed object; and the processing result generated by the at least one remote vendor web server based on the processed object. One would be motivated to do so in order to improve the ease of performing a search for information in the Internet (Fields, col. 2, lines 5-6).

The combination of Stevenson and Fields does not explicitly teach the user preference information including a list of functions defined by the user for inclusion within a function menu; display the function menu on said user interface to prompt the user to select a desired function from the list of user-defined functions included within the function menu to apply the selected function to a selected object wherein the selected object is an object included within an electronic document displayed on said client system and identified by the user; receive the selected object and the selected function from said client system; process the selected object by applying the selected function to the selected object to generate a processed object.

However, Baird teaches the user preference information including a list of functions defined by the user (search immediately or UI prompting for fine tuning – Baird, page 4, paragraph 31) for inclusion within a function menu (Baird, page 3, paragraph 25); display the function menu on said user interface to prompt the user to select a desired function from the

list of user-defined functions included within the function menu to apply the selected function to a selected object wherein the selected object is an object included within an electronic document displayed on said client system and identified by the user; receive the selected object and the selected function from said client system; process the selected object by applying the selected function to the selected object to generate a processed object (Baird, page 3, paragraph 25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Stevenson and Fields in view of Baird in order to enable the user preference information including a list of functions defined by the user for inclusion within a function menu; display the function menu on said user interface to prompt the user to select a desired function from the list of user-defined functions included within the function menu to apply the selected function to a selected object wherein the selected object is an object included within an electronic document displayed on said client system and identified by the user; receive the selected object and the selected function from said client system; process the selected object by applying the selected function to the selected object to generate a processed object. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow a user to configure a search tool using the Internet or other network from within an application (Baird, page 1, paragraph 5).

The combination of Stevenson, Fields, and Baird does not explicitly teach transmitting the processed object from said server system to a web server to at least one remote vendor web server corresponding to the at least one retrieved URL; receive a processing result from the at least one remote vendor web server at said server system, including at least a resulting

web page; determine whether further processing of each process result is necessary to complete the selected function; and transmit at least one of each processing result and another output to said client system.

However, Skillen teaches transmit the processed object from said server system to a web server to at least one remote vendor web server corresponding to the at least one retrieved URL (Skillen, col. 4, lines 30-35); receive a processing result from the at least one remote vendor web server at said server system, including at least a resulting web page; determine whether further processing of each process result is necessary to complete the selected function; and transmit at least one of each processing result and another output to said client system (Skillen, col. 4, lines 41-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Stevenson, Fields, and Baird in view of Skillen in order to enable transmitting the processed object from said server system to a web server to at least one remote vendor web server corresponding to the at least one retrieved URL; receive a processing result from the at least one remote vendor web server at said server system, including at least a resulting web page; determine whether further processing of each process result is necessary to complete the selected function; and transmit at least one of each processing result and another output to said client system. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow a user to quickly find the relevant information for which the user is looking without leaving the user to his/her own imagination to try to think of all the alternative descriptions of a product or service (Skillen, col. 1, lines 23-37).

14.   With respect to claims 2, 11, and 20, the combination of Stevenson, Fields, Baird, and

Skillen teaches the invention described in claims 1, 10, and 19, including a method further

comprising: processing at the client system the at least one of the resulting web page and

other output; and prompting the user to select a command to perform on the resulting web

page (Stevenson, col. 5, lines 60-65).

15.   With respect to claim 3, the combination of Stevenson, Fields, Baird, and Skillen teaches

the invention described in claim 1, including a method wherein displaying the function menu

further comprises selecting an object including at least one of text, a hyperlink, a picture, a

sound file, a video file, and any selectable object included within the electronic document

(Stevenson, Fig. 7, element 133; col. 5, lines 21-22 and 51-53).

16.   With respect to claims 5, 12, and 22, the combination of Stevenson, Fields, Baird, and

Skillen teaches the invention described in claims 1, 10, and 19, including a method wherein

displaying the function menu further comprises utilizing a text-grabbing algorithm to select

the object (Stevenson, Figs. 4-7; col. 5, lines 8-34).

17.   With respect to claims 7, 17, and 24, the combination of Stevenson, Fields, Baird, and

Skillen teaches the invention described in claims 1, 10, and 19, including a method wherein

displaying the function menu on the client system further comprises enabling the user to

customize the function menu by selecting each function included within the function menu

(Baird, page 4, paragraph 31).

18.   With respect to claims 8 and 13, the combination of Stevenson, Fields, Baird, and Skillen

teaches the invention described in claims 1 and 10, including a method wherein displaying

the function menu on the client system further comprises displaying the function menu on the

client system by utilizing at least one of a mouse, a keyboard, a track-ball, a joystick, a

digitizing pad, a touch screen, a voice activation device, and any input device connected to

the client system (Stevenson, col. 5, lines 51-53).

19.   With respect to claim 14, the combination of Stevenson, Fields, Baird, and Skillen

teaches the invention described in claim 10, including a system wherein said client system

further comprises at least one of a cell phone, a computer, a personal digital assistant (PDA),

and a television (Stevenson, col. 2, lines 45-52).

20.   Claims 4, 15, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Stevenson, Fields, Baird, and Skillen as applied to claims 1-3, 5, 7, 8, 10-14, 17, 19, 20, 22,

and 24 above, and further in view of Bates et al. (U.S. 6,735,347).

21.   With respect to claims 4, 15, and 21, Stevenson teaches the invention described in claims

1, 10, and 19, including a network based system for retrieving information, said system

comprising: a client system comprising a user interface and a browser (Stevenson, col. 2,

lines 45-52); a centralized database for storing information (Stevenson, Fig. 2, element 39;

col. 4, lines 45-47); and a server system configured to be coupled to said client system and

said database (Stevenson, Fig. 2, element 33; col. 4, line 50), said server system further configured to: enable the user to select an object from an electronic document displayed on said user interface (Stevenson, Fig. 7, element 133; col. 5, lines 21-22 and 51-53).

Stevenson does not explicitly teach enable a user to input user preference information for storing in the database and a computer-implemented command for performing the associated function.

However, Fields teaches a user to input user preference information for storing in the database (Fields, col. 5, lines 15-25), wherein each function is associated by the user with at least one universal locator (URL) and a computer-implemented command for performing the associated function, wherein the computer-implemented command is configured by the user to perform the associated function at at least one remote vendor web server corresponding to the at least one associated URL (Fields, col. 4, lines 14-22); the process further including: retrieve from the database the at least one URL and the computer-implemented command associated with the selected function (Fields, col. 5, line 51 – col. 6, line 24); execute the retrieved computer-implemented command using the selected object to generate the processed object; and the processing result generated by the at least one remote vendor web server based on the processed object (Fields, col. 6, lines 25-29); and transmitting at least a portion of the extracted text from the client system to the server system such that the server system processes the extracted text (Fields, col. 5, line 34 – col. 6, line 29).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Stevenson in view of Fields in order to enable a user to input user preference information for storing in the database, wherein each function is associated by the

user with at least one universal locator (URL) and a computer-implemented command for performing the associated function, wherein the computer-implemented command is configured by the user to perform the associated function at at least one remote vendor web server corresponding to the at least one associated URL; the process further including: retrieve from the database the at least one URL and the computer-implemented command associated with the selected function; execute the retrieved computer-implemented command using the selected object to generate the processed object; and the processing result generated by the at least one remote vendor web server based on the processed object. One would be motivated to do so in order to improve the ease of performing a search for information in the Internet (Fields, col. 2, lines 5-6).

The combination of Stevenson and Fields does not explicitly teach the user preference information including a list of functions defined by the user for inclusion within a function menu; display the function menu on said user interface to prompt the user to select a desired function from the list of user-defined functions included within the function menu to apply the selected function to a selected object wherein the selected object is an object included within an electronic document displayed on said client system and identified by the user; receive the selected object and the selected function from said client system; process the selected object by applying the selected function to the selected object to generate a processed object.

However, Baird teaches the user preference information including a list of functions defined by the user (search immediately or UI prompting for fine tuning – Baird, page 4, paragraph 31) for inclusion within a function menu (Baird, page 3, paragraph 25); display the

function menu on said user interface to prompt the user to select a desired function from the list of user-defined functions included within the function menu to apply the selected function to a selected object wherein the selected object is an object included within an electronic document displayed on said client system and identified by the user; receive the selected object and the selected function from said client system; process the selected object by applying the selected function to the selected object to generate a processed object (Baird, page 3, paragraph 25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Stevenson and Fields in view of Baird in order to enable the user preference information including a list of functions defined by the user for inclusion within a function menu; display the function menu on said user interface to prompt the user to select a desired function from the list of user-defined functions included within the function menu to apply the selected function to a selected object wherein the selected object is an object included within an electronic document displayed on said client system and identified by the user; receive the selected object and the selected function from said client system; process the selected object by applying the selected function to the selected object to generate a processed object. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow a user to configure a search tool using the Internet or other network from within an application (Baird, page 1, paragraph 5).

The combination of Stevenson, Fields, and Baird does not explicitly teach transmitting the processed object from said server system to a web server to at least one remote vendor web server corresponding to the at least one retrieved URL; receive a processing result from

the at least one remote vendor web server at said server system, including at least a resulting web page; determine whether further processing of each process result is necessary to complete the selected function; and transmit at least one of each processing result and another output to said client system.

However, Skillen teaches transmit the processed object from said server system to a web server to at least one remote vendor web server corresponding to the at least one retrieved URL (Skillen, col. 4, lines 30-35); receive a processing result from the at least one remote vendor web server at said server system, including at least a resulting web page; determine whether further processing of each process result is necessary to complete the selected function; and transmit at least one of each processing result and another output to said client system (Skillen, col. 4, lines 41-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Stevenson, Fields, and Baird in view of Skillen in order to enable transmitting the processed object from said server system to a web server to at least one remote vendor web server corresponding to the at least one retrieved URL; receive a processing result from the at least one remote vendor web server at said server system, including at least a resulting web page; determine whether further processing of each process result is necessary to complete the selected function; and transmit at least one of each processing result and another output to said client system. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow a user to quickly find the relevant information for which the user is looking without leaving the user to his/her own imagination to try to think of all the alternative descriptions of a product or service (Skillen, col. 1, lines 23-37).

The combination of Stevenson, Fields, Baird, and Skillen does not explicitly teach a method wherein displaying the function menu further comprises: processing the selected object using optical character recognition (OCR) and extracting text from the selected object using OCR.

However, Bates teaches a method wherein displaying the function menu further comprises: processing the selected object using optical character recognition (OCR) and extracting text from the selected object using OCR (Bates, col. 5, lines 15-56).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Stevenson, Fields, Baird, and Skillen in view of Bates in order to enable a method wherein displaying the function menu further comprises: processing the selected object using optical character recognition (OCR) and extracting text from the selected object using OCR. One would be motivated to do so in order to convert textual information contained within an image easily and automatically (Bates, col. 5, lines 36-37).

22.   Claims 6, 16, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stevenson, Fields, Baird, and Skillen as applied to claims 1-3, 5, 7, 8, 10-14, 17, 19, 20, 22, and 24 above, and further in view of Debaty (U.S. 2004/0015484).

23.   With respect to claims 6, 16, and 23, Stevenson teaches the invention described in claims 1, 10, and 19, including a network based system for retrieving information, said system

comprising: a client system comprising a user interface and a browser (Stevenson, col. 2, lines 45-52); a centralized database for storing information (Stevenson, Fig. 2, element 39; col. 4, lines 45-47); and a server system configured to be coupled to said client system and said database (Stevenson, Fig. 2, element 33; col. 4, line 50), said server system further configured to: enable the user to select an object from an electronic document displayed on said user interface (Stevenson, Fig. 7, element 133; col. 5, lines 21-22 and 51-53).

Stevenson does not explicitly teach enable a user to input user preference information for storing in the database and a computer-implemented command for performing the associated function.

However, Fields teaches a user to input user preference information for storing in the database (Fields, col. 5, lines 15-25), wherein each function is associated by the user with at least one universal locator (URL) and a computer-implemented command for performing the associated function, wherein the computer-implemented command is configured by the user to perform the associated function at at least one remote vendor web server corresponding to the at least one associated URL (Fields, col. 4, lines 14-22); the process further including: retrieve from the database the at least one URL and the computer-implemented command associated with the selected function (Fields, col. 5, line 51 – col. 6, line 24); execute the retrieved computer-implemented command using the selected object to generate the processed object; and the processing result generated by the at least one remote vendor web server based on the processed object (Fields, col. 6, lines 25-29); and a method wherein displaying the function menu on the client system further comprises enabling the user to designate a first web site as a target web site for a first function included within the function

menu, and associate a first computer-implemented command with the first function executable using the first web site, the first computer-implemented command formatted by the user of the at least one client system (Fields, col. 4, lines 14-22).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Stevenson in view of Fields in order to enable a user to input user preference information for storing in the database, wherein each function is associated by the user with at least one universal locator (URL) and a computer-implemented command for performing the associated function, wherein the computer-implemented command is configured by the user to perform the associated function at at least one remote vendor web server corresponding to the at least one associated URL; the process further including: retrieve from the database the at least one URL and the computer-implemented command associated with the selected function; execute the retrieved computer-implemented command using the selected object to generate the processed object; and the processing result generated by the at least one remote vendor web server based on the processed object. One would be motivated to do so in order to improve the ease of performing a search for information in the Internet (Fields, col. 2, lines 5-6).

The combination of Stevenson and Fields does not explicitly teach the user preference information including a list of functions defined by the user for inclusion within a function menu; display the function menu on said user interface to prompt the user to select a desired function from the list of user-defined functions included within the function menu to apply the selected function to a selected object wherein the selected object is an object included within an electronic document displayed on said client system and identified by the user;

receive the selected object and the selected function from said client system; process the selected object by applying the selected function to the selected object to generate a processed object.

However, Baird teaches the user preference information including a list of functions defined by the user (search immediately or UI prompting for fine tuning – Baird, page 4, paragraph 31) for inclusion within a function menu (Baird, page 3, paragraph 25); display the function menu on said user interface to prompt the user to select a desired function from the list of user-defined functions included within the function menu to apply the selected function to a selected object wherein the selected object is an object included within an electronic document displayed on said client system and identified by the user; receive the selected object and the selected function from said client system; process the selected object by applying the selected function to the selected object to generate a processed object (Baird, page 3, paragraph 25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Stevenson and Fields in view of Baird in order to enable the user preference information including a list of functions defined by the user for inclusion within a function menu; display the function menu on said user interface to prompt the user to select a desired function from the list of user-defined functions included within the function menu to apply the selected function to a selected object wherein the selected object is an object included within an electronic document displayed on said client system and identified by the user; receive the selected object and the selected function from said client system; process the selected object by applying the selected function to the selected

object to generate a processed object. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow a user to configure a search tool using the Internet or other network from within an application (Baird, page 1, paragraph 5).

The combination of Stevenson, Fields, and Baird does not explicitly teach transmitting the processed object from said server system to a web server to at least one remote vendor web server corresponding to the at least one retrieved URL; receive a processing result from the at least one remote vendor web server at said server system, including at least a resulting web page; determine whether further processing of each process result is necessary to complete the selected function; and transmit at least one of each processing result and another output to said client system.

However, Skillen teaches transmit the processed object from said server system to a web server to at least one remote vendor web server corresponding to the at least one retrieved URL (Skillen, col. 4, lines 30-35); receive a processing result from the at least one remote vendor web server at said server system, including at least a resulting web page; determine whether further processing of each process result is necessary to complete the selected function; and transmit at least one of each processing result and another output to said client system (Skillen, col. 4, lines 41-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Stevenson, Fields, and Baird in view of Skillen in order to enable transmitting the processed object from said server system to a web server to at least one remote vendor web server corresponding to the at least one retrieved URL; receive a processing result from the at least one remote vendor web server at said server

system, including at least a resulting web page; determine whether further processing of each process result is necessary to complete the selected function; and transmit at least one of each processing result and another output to said client system. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow a user to quickly find the relevant information for which the user is looking without leaving the user to his/her own imagination to try to think of all the alternative descriptions of a product or service (Skillen, col. 1, lines 23-37).

The combination of Stevenson, Fields, Baird, and Skillen does not explicitly teach performing a purchasing function at the target web site.

However, Debaty teaches to perform a purchasing function at the target web site (Debaty, Fig. 5; page 3, paragraph 36 and page 4, paragraph 20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify combination of Stevenson, Fields, Baird, and Skillen in view of Debaty in order to enable performing a purchasing function at the target web site. One would be motivated to do so in order to dramatically enhance the capabilities of the web browser of the client because the user can now simply click on the added URLs to invoke the respective context-aware services within their respective personalized environments (Debaty, page 3, paragraph 37).

24.   Claims 9, 18, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stevenson, Fields, Baird, and Skillen as applied to claims 1-3, 5, 7, 8, 10-14, 17, 19, 20, 22, and 24 above, and further in view of Debaty and Anupam et al. (U.S. 6,535,912).

25.   With respect to claims 9, 18 and 25, Stevenson teaches the invention described in claims

1, 10, and 19, including a network based system for retrieving information, said system

comprising: a client system comprising a user interface and a browser (Stevenson, col. 2,

lines 45-52); a centralized database for storing information (Stevenson, Fig. 2, element 39;

col. 4, lines 45-47); and a server system configured to be coupled to said client system and

said database (Stevenson, Fig. 2, element 33; col. 4, line 50), said server system further

configured to: enable the user to select an object from an electronic document displayed on

said user interface (Stevenson, Fig. 7, element 133; col. 5, lines 21-22 and 51-53).

Stevenson does not explicitly teach enable a user to input user preference information for

storing in the database and a computer-implemented command for performing the associated

function.

However, Fields teaches a user to input user preference information for storing in the

database (Fields, col. 5, lines 15-25), wherein each function is associated by the user with at

least one universal locator (URL) and a computer-implemented command for performing the

associated function, wherein the computer-implemented command is configured by the user

to perform the associated function at at least one remote vendor web server corresponding to

the at least one associated URL (Fields, col. 4, lines 14-22); the process further including:

retrieve from the database the at least one URL and the computer-implemented command

associated with the selected function (Fields, col. 5, line 51 – col. 6, line 24); execute the

retrieved computer-implemented command using the selected object to generate the

processed object; and the processing result generated by the at least one remote vendor web

server based on the processed object (Fields, col. 6, lines 25-29); a method wherein

processing the selected object by applying the selected function at the server system further comprises: applying the user preference information (Fields, col. 5, lines 15-25) to the selected object (Fields, col. 5, line 51 – col. 6, line 24), and a plurality of URLs (Fields, col. 5, line 51 – col. 6, line 24); communicating with a vendor web server corresponding to each of the plurality of URLs (Fields, col. 5, line 51 – col. 6, line 24); generating a processing result at each of the vendor web servers by processing the selected objects; transmitting the processing results from each of the vendor web servers to the server system (Fields, col. 6, lines 25-29); and processing each of the processing results at the server system before transmitting at least one resulting web page and other output to the client system (Fields, col. 4, lines 23-37 and col. 7, lines 25-51).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Stevenson in view of Fields in order to enable a user to input user preference information for storing in the database, wherein each function is associated by the user with at least one universal locator (URL) and a computer-implemented command for performing the associated function, wherein the computer-implemented command is configured by the user to perform the associated function at at least one remote vendor web server corresponding to the at least one associated URL; the process further including: retrieve from the database the at least one URL and the computer-implemented command associated with the selected function; execute the retrieved computer-implemented command using the selected object to generate the processed object; and the processing result generated by the at least one remote vendor web server based on the processed object. One would be

motivated to do so in order to improve the ease of performing a search for information in the Internet (Fields, col. 2, lines 5-6).

The combination of Stevenson and Fields does not explicitly teach the user preference information including a list of functions defined by the user for inclusion within a function menu; display the function menu on said user interface to prompt the user to select a desired function from the list of user-defined functions included within the function menu to apply the selected function to a selected object wherein the selected object is an object included within an electronic document displayed on said client system and identified by the user; receive the selected object and the selected function from said client system; process the selected object by applying the selected function to the selected object to generate a processed object.

However, Baird teaches the user preference information including a list of functions defined by the user (search immediately or UI prompting for fine tuning – Baird, page 4, paragraph 31) for inclusion within a function menu (Baird, page 3, paragraph 25); display the function menu on said user interface to prompt the user to select a desired function from the list of user-defined functions included within the function menu to apply the selected function to a selected object wherein the selected object is an object included within an electronic document displayed on said client system and identified by the user; receive the selected object and the selected function from said client system; process the selected object by applying the selected function to the selected object to generate a processed object (Baird, page 3, paragraph 25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Stevenson and Fields in view of Baird in order to enable the user preference information including a list of functions defined by the user for inclusion within a function menu; display the function menu on said user interface to prompt the user to select a desired function from the list of user-defined functions included within the function menu to apply the selected function to a selected object wherein the selected object is an object included within an electronic document displayed on said client system and identified by the user; receive the selected object and the selected function from said client system; process the selected object by applying the selected function to the selected object to generate a processed object. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow a user to configure a search tool using the Internet or other network from within an application (Baird, page 1, paragraph 5).

The combination of Stevenson, Fields, and Baird does not explicitly teach transmitting the processed object from said server system to a web server to at least one remote vendor web server corresponding to the at least one retrieved URL; receive a processing result from the at least one remote vendor web server at said server system, including at least a resulting web page; determine whether further processing of each process result is necessary to complete the selected function; and transmit at least one of each processing result and another output to said client system.

However, Skillen teaches transmit the processed object from said server system to a web server to at least one remote vendor web server corresponding to the at least one retrieved URL (Skillen, col. 4, lines 30-35); receive a processing result from the at least one remote

vendor web server at said server system, including at least a resulting web page; determine whether further processing of each process result is necessary to complete the selected function; and transmit at least one of each processing result and another output to said client system (Skillen, col. 4, lines 41-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Stevenson, Fields, and Baird in view of Skillen in order to enable transmitting the processed object from said server system to a web server to at least one remote vendor web server corresponding to the at least one retrieved URL; receive a processing result from the at least one remote vendor web server at said server system, including at least a resulting web page; determine whether further processing of each process result is necessary to complete the selected function; and transmit at least one of each processing result and another output to said client system. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow a user to quickly find the relevant information for which the user is looking without leaving the user to his/her own imagination to try to think of all the alternative descriptions of a product or service (Skillen, col. 1, lines 23-37).

The combination of Stevenson, Fields, Baird, and Skillen does not explicitly teach wherein the user preference information includes a first purchasing function associated with a first purchasing command.

However, Debaty teaches wherein the user preference information includes a first purchasing function associated with a first purchasing command (Debaty, Fig. 5; page 3, paragraph 36 and page 4, paragraph 20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify combination of Stevenson, Fields, Baird, and Skillen in view of Debaty in order to enable wherein the user preference information includes a first purchasing function associated with a first purchasing command. One would be motivated to do so in order to dramatically enhance the capabilities of the web browser of the client because the user can now simply click on the added URLs to invoke the respective context-aware services within their respective personalized environments (Debaty, page 3, paragraph 37).

The combination of Stevenson, Fields, Baird, Skillen, and Debaty does not explicitly teach the first purchasing command formatted to purchase an item corresponding to the selected object based on a purchase price for the item.

However, Anupam teaches the first purchasing command formatted to purchase an item corresponding to the selected object based on a purchase price for the item (Anupam, col. 4, line 56 – col. 5, line 24).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Stevenson, Fields, Baird, Skillen, and Debaty in view of Anupam in order to enable the first purchasing command formatted to purchase an item corresponding to the selected object based on a purchase price for the item. One would be motivated to do so in order to enable the user to automatically go directly to the web page containing the most current listing of items that meet the criteria without having to manually go through intermediate steps (Anupam, col. 5, lines 14-19).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alicia Baturay whose telephone number is (571) 272-3981. The examiner can normally be reached at 7:30am - 5pm, Monday - Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wing Chan can be reached on (571) 272-7493. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be

obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Alicia Baturay/   /Wing F. Chan/
Examiner, Art Unit 2441   Supervisory Patent Examiner,
                                                        Art Unit 2441

June 8, 2011